DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 131 CS 502 186

AUTHOR Hellweg, Susan A.
TITLE The Measurement of Gerald Ford against the Ideal Political Candidate as a Function of Respondent Political Party Affiliation in the Context of the 1976 General Election.
PUB DATE Apr 78
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (Chicago, Illinois, April 25-29, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Credibility; *Elections; *Political Affiliation; *Political Attitudes; Presidents; *Public Opinion; *Social Science Research
IDENTIFIERS *Ford (Gerald R)

ABSTRACT

Undertaken in conjunction with the 1976 presidential election, this study examined perceptions of Gerald R. Ford against conceptualizations of the ideal political candidate. Questionnaires were administered to 321 undergraduates (both Republicans and Democrats) in order to measure perceived credibility and homophily of the ideal candidate and of Ford. Results indicate that it is more important to a member of either party that a candidate appear to possess certain qualities than to be perceived as similar in beliefs, attitudes, background, or personality. Democrats and Republicans vary only slightly in their perceptions of the ideal candidate. Republicans perceived Ford as more credible and more similar to themselves on attitude-belief items. Democrats apparently did not see Ford as being similar to themselves in any respect, although they rated him highly on experience, character, and intelligence. Republicans saw Ford as deviating from the ideal on only a few credibility items, while Democrats perceived deviation on several credibility and homophily items. Neither party saw Ford as matching the ideal in terms of poise, reliability, justice, responsibility, or competence. (Recommendations for further research and tables of findings are included.) (DF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED157131

THE MEASUREMENT OF GERALD FORD AGAINST THE IDEAL POLITICAL CANDIDATE AS A FUNCTION OF RESPONDENT POLITICAL PARTY AFFILIATION IN THE CONTEXT OF THE 1976 GENERAL ELECTION

Susan A. Hellweg

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Susan A. Hellweg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention
Political Communication Division

April 1978
Chicago, Illinois

IC 5502 186

The author is currently the Assistant Director of Research and holds a faculty position in the Behavioral Science Graduate Program at California State University, Dominguez Hills. This paper is based upon data collected in conjunction with her doctoral dissertation, directed by Dr. Kenneth K. Sereno at the University of Southern California, 1977.

THE MEASUREMENT OF GERALD FORD AGAINST THE IDEAL POLITICAL CANDIDATE AS A FUNCTION OF RESPONDENT POLITICAL PARTY AFFILIATION IN THE CONTEXT OF THE 1976 GENERAL ELECTION

The success of a political campaign depends largely upon the qualities of the candidate that are communicated to the electorate. Campaign specialists make an effort to see that their candidate is presented to the public according to a particular image. It is the task of the campaign specialist and his/her staff to infuse positive candidate characteristics into the minds of the electorate in the face of less optimal realities. A selection process ensues in which the campaign organizers choose what information shall be projected to the public, in terms of appealing candidate qualities, and through what channels these attributes can be most effectively communicated. A principal strategy of a campaign specialist is to establish what members of the voting public conceive as the ideal political candidate and then convince them that his/her candidate falls within the parameters of this conceptualization (Anatol, 1975). For any election, voters acquire an overall vision of the ideal candidate and use it as a gauge in evaluating the acceptability of actual candidates (Nimmo and Savage, 1971; Nimmo and Savage, 1976).

A political campaign centers upon the activities of an individual (the candidate) within a particular context (the campaign setting) which are designed to influence the behavior of an audience (the voters), so as to enhance his/her own interests (win the election). This process, as it is described, fits within the parameters of the persuasion paradigm examined by behavioral scientists, specifically communication researchers. Its basic components consist of a source communicating messages to an audience in a specific context and receiving feedback in return. As the communication paradigm seems

to be an integral part of a political campaign, so would source valence[1] constructs, such as credibility[2] and homophily,[3] appear to be relevant to the perception of political campaign candidates.

The 1976 Presidential Election could probably be described as having been a campaign between two moderates, a moderate conservative, Gerald Ford, and a moderate liberal, Jimmy Carter. It was, perhaps, a campaign of traditionalism, one characterized by a lack of any real new burning issues. Possibly one of the most unique features of the campaign was the televised debates between the candidates, providing the American public the opportunity of seeing the two contenders shadow box one another under the fire of a barrage of high pressure questions. Carter, the former Governor of Georgia and the first man to emerge as a major party Presidential candidate from the Deep South since 1848, was identified throughout the campaign as being ambitious and self-confident, but also as inconsistent and ambiguous on his stand on issues. In addition, there was some question as to his ability to handle foreign affairs and the Washington scene, since he had virtually no experience with either. In contrast, the incumbent President, Gerald Ford, was particularly noted for his considerable experience in handling foreign affairs and his participating in the Washington scene. On the other hand, while Ford was perceived as a likeable, stable, undevious politician, he was also seen as predictable, bland, and somewhat a bumbler, as evidenced by the comment he made in the second televised debate on Soviet domination in Eastern Europe. While Carter was heavily criticized for his interview with Playboy Magazine, Ford was constantly under fire for his support of the Nixon pardon and the way in which he handled his Secretary of Agriculture, Earl Butz, when he publicly made some anti-Black jokes. In the absence of specific major issues, it was clearly a campaign in which candidate

personalities played a significant role.

Purpose of the Study

This study was designed to examine perceptions of Gerald Ford against conceptualizations of the ideal political candidate, as a function of respondent political party affiliation, in conjunction with the 1976 General Election. This research was designed to provide a slightly different historical perspective of a presidential election; rather than comparing opposing candidates, as is normally done in political science research, this study examined one candidate in comparison with an ideal criterion conceived by the respondents.

Subjects

The three hundred and twenty-one subjects employed in this study were students from social science classes at California State University, Long Beach. Of these, 49.5% were males and 51.5% were females. In terms of respondent political party affiliation, the following breakdown was reported: (1) 59.8%, Democrats; and (2) 40.2%, Republicans.[4]

Materials

The instruments employed in this study were the following: (1) for measuring source credibility, the scales (thirty semantic differential items) developed, specifically for assessing the perceived credibility of public figures, by McCroskey, Jensen, and Todd (1972)[5]; and (2) for measuring homophily, the scales (thirteen semantic differential[6] items) developed, specifically for assessing the perceived homophily of public figures, by Andersen and Todd (1975).[7]

Procedure

The administration of all questionnaires to the subjects occurred within the week prior to the 1976 General Election. Respondents were

initially provided with a short demographic questionnaire to ascertain their sex and political party affiliation. Following this, subjects were asked to complete credibility and homophily items in response to the ideal male political candidate.[8] Subsequent to the completion of these items, the researcher then distributed another set of identical questionnaires and requested respondents to fill these out using as a referent a current political candidate, President Gerald R. Ford.[9] Finally, subjects were asked to complete a single Likert scale item in response to how ideal they felt Ford was as a candidate. On all questionnaires, subjects were given a guarantee of the anonymity of their responses to the items. Upon completion of all the scales, all subjects were debriefed by the researcher as to the specific nature of the study.

Overview of Data Analysis

The data derived from this study were submitted to the following statistical procedures: (1) one-way analysis of variance, using a .05 level as an acceptable criterion for significance, to examine responses, first, to the ideal political candidate and, second, to Gerald Ford, across respondent political party affiliation, as well to examine responses to the single Likert scale item on the idealness of Ford as a candidate, across these same categories; (2) two-tailed paired *t*-test, using a .05 level as an acceptable criterion for significance, to examine responses to the ideal political candidate against those for Gerald Ford, across respondent political party affiliation categories; and (3) strength of association test (omega squared), to determine the substantive effect of any significant differences emerging from the two-tailed paired *t*-test. In addition, frequency distributions were established in order to examine response means and standard deviations across each of the demographic categories.[10]

Results

Means & Standard Deviations for Ideal Political Candidate by Respondent Political Party Affiliation

Means for the responses by Democrats to the ideal candidate credibility items fell between 1.366 ("honest-dishonest") and 3.466 ("adventurous-cautious"), with twelve of the items below 2.0, fifteen of the items between 2.0 and 3.0, and two of the items over 3.0. Standard deviations for these items ranged from 0.724 ("intelligent-unintelligent") to 1.557 ("calm-anxious"), with thirteen of the items below 1.0, fifteen of the items between 1.0 and 1.5, and one of the items over 1.5.

Means for the responses by Democrats to the ideal candidate homophily items fell between 2.505 ("shares my beliefs-doesn't share my beliefs") and 3.775 ("educational background similar to mine-educational background dissimilar to mine"), with four of the items below 3.0 and nine of the items over 3.0. Standard deviations for these items ranged from 0.981 ("likes same politicians that I like-doesn't like same politicians that I like") to 1.398 ("educational background similar to mine-educational background dissimilar to mine"), with one of the items below 1.0, the other twelve items between 1.0 and 1.5.

Means for the responses by Republicans to the ideal candidate credibility items fell between 1.203 ("reliable-unreliable") to 3.648 ("adventurous-cautious"), with fourteen of the items below 2.0, twelve of the items between 2.0 and 3.0, and three of the items over 3.0. Standard deviations for these items ranged from 0.566 ("reliable-unreliable") to 1.395 ("adventurous-cautious"), with nineteen of the items below 1.0, and the other ten items between 1.0 and 1.5.

Means for the responses by Republicans to the ideal candidate homophily items fell between 2.310 ("shares my beliefs-doesn't share my beliefs") and 3.727 ("background similar to mine-background dissimilar to mine"), with four of the items below 3.0 and nine of the items over 3.0. Standard deviations for these items ranged from 0.986 ("goals for the country same as mine-goals for the country different than mine") to 1.485 ("educational background similar to mine-educational background dissimilar to mine"), with one of the items below 1.0, the other twelve items between 1.0 and 1.5.

Means & Standard Deviations for Gerald Ford by Respondent Political Political Party Affiliation

Means for the responses by Democrats to Gerald Ford credibility items fell between 3.016 ("good-natured-irritable") and 4.889 ("adventurous-cautious"), with twenty-five of the items below 4.0 and four of the items over 4.0. Standard deviations for these items ranged from 1.116 ("kind-cruel") to 1.600 ("believable-unbelievable"), with twenty-five of the items between 1.0 and 1.5, the other four items over 1.5.

Means for the responses by Democrats to Gerald Ford homophily items fell between 4.405 ("goals for the country same as mine-goals for the country different than mine") and 5.842 ("political party same as mine-political party different than mine"), with nine of the items below 5.0 and four of the items over 5.0. Standard deviations for these items ranged from 1.513 ("likes same politicians that I like-doesn't like same politicians that I like") to 1.926 ("political party same as mine-political party different than mine"), with all thirteen items between 1.5 and 2.0.

Means for the responses by Republicans to Gerald Ford credibility items fell between 2.295 ("experienced-inexperienced") and 4.124

("adventurous-cautious"), with nineteen of the items below 3.0, nine of the items between 3.0 and 4.0, and one of the items over 4.0. Standard deviations for these items ranged from 0.979 ("kind-cruel") to 1.452 ("adventurous-cautious"), with all but one item between 1.0 and 1.5.

Means for the responses by Republicans to Gerald Ford homophily items fell between 0.986 ("goals for the country same as mine-goals for the country different than mine") and 1.485 ("educational background similar to mine-educational background different than mine"), with all but one item between 1.0 and 1.5. Standard deviations for these items ranged from 1.210 ("goals for the country same as mine-goals for the country different than mine") to 1.762 ("from same social class as mine-from different social class than mine"), with nine of the items between 1.0 and 1.5, the other four items over 1.5.

Analysis of Variance for Ideal Political Candidate by Respondent Political Party Affiliation

Through a one-way analysis of variance, significant differences at the .05 level were found between Democrats and Republicans for the following items in perceiving the ideal political candidate: (1) credibility -- "reliable-unreliable" and "talkative-silent"; and (2) homophily -- "goals for the country same as mine-goals for the country different than mine" and "political beliefs same as mine-political beliefs different than mine."

Analysis of Variance for Gerald Ford by Respondent Political Party Affiliation

Through a one-way analysis of variance, significant differences at the .05 level were found between Democrats and Republicans for the following items in perceiving Gerald Ford: (1) credibility -- "experienced-inexperienced," "believable-unbelievable," "bold-timid," "poised-nervous," "attractive-unattractive," "admirable-

contemptible," "adventurous-cautious," "nice-awful," "reliable-unreliable," "relaxed-tense," "good-bad," "verbal-quiet," "energetic-tired," "just-unjust," "cheerful-gloomy," "honest-dishonest," "intellectual-narrow," "talkative-silent," "kind-cruel," "extroverted-introverted," "good-natured-irritable," "responsible-undependable," "aggressive-meek," "trained-untrained," "competent-incompetent," "expert-inexpert," and "intelligent-unintelligent"; and (2) homophily -- "background similar to mine-background dissimilar to mine," "goals for the country same as mine-goals for the country different than mine," "political party same as mine-political party different than mine," "personality similar to mine-personality dissimilar to mine," "from same social class as mine-from different social class than mine," "shares my beliefs-doesn't share my beliefs," "like me-unlike me," "political attitudes about the same as mine-political attitudes not about the same as mine," "cultural background similar to mine-cultural background dissimilar to mine," "likes same politicians that I like-doesn't like same politicians that I like," "educational background similar to mine-educational background dissimilar to mine," "political beliefs same as mine-political beliefs different than mine," and "goals in life about same as mine-goals in life not about same as mine."

Paired t-Values & Strength of Association Values for Ideal Political Candidate Versus Gerald Ford by Respondent Political Party Affiliation

Using 1.960 as the critical value of *t* at the .05 level in comparing responses to the ideal political candidate and Gerald Ford, it was determined that a significant difference existed for all credibility and homophily items for both Democrats and Republicans.

Following this procedure, the data were submitted to a strength of association test (omega squared) as described by Hays (1963), to determine the substantive effect of these significant differences. In doing so, the following range of percentages were found: (1) for

Democrats, credibility item comparisons -- from 14.77% ("nice-awful") to 64.22% ("just-unjust"); (2) for Democrats, homophily item comparisons -- from 20.54% ("educational background similar to mine-educational background dissimilar to mine") to 55.13% ("political attitudes about the same as mine-political attitudes not about the same as mine"); (3) for Republicans, credibility item comparisons -- from 3.35% ("nice-awful") to 54.81% ("reliable-unreliable"); and (4) for Republicans, homophily item comparisons -- from 1.11% ("from same social class as mine-from different social class than mine") to 37.33% ("political party same as mine-political party different than mine").

Employing 40% as a criterion for omega squared values in determining actual significant differences,[11] it was found that for sixteen out of twenty-nine credibility items (55%) and eight out of thirteen homophily items (62%) marked by Democrats and for five out of twenty-nine credibility items (17%) and no homophily items marked by Republicans, the differences were statistically significant. For Democrats, the credibility items were: "believable-unbelievable," "poised-nervous," "admirable-contemptible," "reliable-unreliable," "relaxed-tense," "good-bad," "energetic-tired," "just-unjust," "cheerful-gloomy," "honest-dishonest," "intellectual-narrow," "responsible-undependable," "aggressive-meek," "competent-incompetent," "expert-inexpert," and "intelligent-unintelligent." For Democrats, the homophily items were: "background similar to mine-background dissimilar to mine," "goals for the country same as mine-goals for the country different than mine," "political party same as mine-political party different than mine," "shares my beliefs-doesn't share my beliefs," "like me-unlike me," "political attitudes about the same as mine-political attitudes not about the same as mine,"

"likes same politicians that I like-doesn't like same politicians that I like," and "political beliefs same as mine-political beliefs different than mine." For Republicans, the credibility items were: "poised-nervous," "reliable-unreliable," "just-unjust," "responsible-undependable," and "competent-incompetent."

Analysis for Single Likert Scale Item

The following means and standard deviations were reported for the single seven-point Likert scale item requesting subjects to indicate their perception of how ideal a candidate Gerald Ford was: (1) Democrats -- mean, 4.743, standard deviation, 1.835; and (2) Republicans -- mean, 3.114, standard deviation, 1.47[9]. The performance of a one-way analysis of variance further demonstrated a significant difference between Democrat and Republican responses to this item. This difference is most dramatically revealed in the modal response provided by each of the two groups, the Republicans with a 2.000 and the Democrats with a 6.000.

Discussion

This study was designed to examine Gerald Ford against conceptualizations of the ideal political candidate, as a function of respondent political party affiliation, in the context of the 1976 General Election. In doing so, this research was intended to provide a slightly different historical perspective of a presidential election, through comparison of a candidate with an ideal criterion, rather than an opposing candidate, as is typically done in political science studies.

The data derived from this study suggests that for both Democrats and Republicans credibility attributes (source-oriented qualities) are more preferable in extreme quantity than homophily attributes (source-receiver relationship qualities) for the ideal political candidate.

In other words, it appears that it is more important to a member of either party that a political candidate appear to possess certain qualities than be perceived as similar in beliefs, attitudes, background, or personality. Within the area of homophily attributes, similarities between politician and voter in beliefs and attitudes appear to be more important criteria in judging the acceptability of candidates than similarities in personality or background.

According to the results of this study, Democrats and Republicans vary minimally in their perceptions of the ideal political candidate. In fact, only four items were found to be significantly different between the two parties; among these, only one ("talkative-silent") was marked more closely to the extreme positive end of the scale by Democrats than by Republicans.

Both Democrats and Republicans agreed that the six most important qualities to be found in the ideal political candidate are that he/she be reliable, responsible, honest, just, competent, and intelligent. This seems reasonable in view of the nature of the office politicians seek; the character-related items appear particularly relevant in view of recent investigations of numerous officials, as a result of the Watergate case and other government scandals. Expertness appears to be a quality that members of both parties prefer only in moderation in reference to the ideal political candidate. This may be due to the fact that voters want a politician who is flexible, willing to learn, and receptive to the advice of others.

Gerald Ford was perceived by Democratic respondents significantly differently than by Republican respondents on all homophily items and all but two credibility items ("sociable-unsociable" and "calm-anxious"). In all cases, the Republicans perceived Gerald Ford more favorably (credibility items) or more similar to themselves (homophily items)

than the Democrats. The attributes for which Ford was given the highest ranking by Republicans related to his being perceived as experienced, intelligent, responsible, trained, kind, and good-natured. Additionally, Republicans thought Ford was most similar to themselves on attitude-belief items, but lesser so on personality or background items. Democrats rated Ford the most favorably on items related to his being experienced, nice, sociable, kind, good-natured, and intelligent. They ranked him as being neutral or slightly negative on all of the similarity-dissimilarity items of the homophily scale, so it is hard to say that they found him similar to themselves in any respect. The results of this study support the contention that political party affiliation plays a role in voting decisions. However, the variability among the Republican responses to items and the distance of them in modal form from the extreme positive end of the scale strengthens the argument that voters do make personal choices within their party and do not simply see the candidate in a totally favorable light in all respects.

Republicans saw Gerald Ford as deviating significantly from the ideal political candidate on only five credibility items (no homophily items); Democrats saw Gerald Ford as deviating significantly from the ideal political candidate on sixteen credibility items and eight homophily items. An analysis of the specific items involved here suggests that neither Republicans nor Democrats saw Gerald Ford as matching their ideal criterion in terms of being poised, reliable, just, responsible, or competent, all qualities which would be extremely important in a potential President. Perhaps, no candidate *ever* does reach the full expectations of voters in these areas. This is a concern for future research.

In conjunction with this discussion, it is, perhaps, relevant to bring out some methodological difficulties which may have occurred in

the completion of items by subjects in this study. It is conceivable that the high level of responding at or toward the neutral area of the semantic differential (as reflected in the means) for the ideal candidate and Gerald Ford, accompanied by large variances in response patterns (as reflected in the standard deviations) for particular items, occurred as a result of the absence of true bipolar adjectives for these scales. Cases in point would be: "adventurous-cautious," "intellectual-narrow," and "verbal-quiet." An alternative explanation for such occurrences, as well as for those items with high means but moderate standard deviations, might be that the respondents found certain items to be relatively immaterial criteria in perceiving the target sources. Examples of items, perhaps, fitting within the parameters of this explanation would be: "personality similar to mine-personality dissimilar to mine," "educational background similar to mine-educational background dissimilar to mine," and "from same social class as mine-from different social class than mine." One should be cautioned, however, in making such interpretations, since it is, in fact, often very difficult to determine whether respondents find an item an immaterial criterion in evaluating a target source, or whether they actually envision that source in this position on the scale for that item. An example in this particular study might be the item "attractive-unattractive," for which the ideal political candidate mean was 4.245 for Democrats and 3.729 for Republicans.[12]

Another difficulty for respondents in completing the scale items for both target sources might have been the conceptual variability on an item in view of the numerous contexts in which it occurs. An example of an item presenting this problem would be "adventurous-cautious." While an individual might desire a politician who would

be cautious in regard to diplomatic relations with foreign powers, he/she might also want a politician who would be at least somewhat adventurous in regard to domestic inflation and the predominance of seemingly worn-out economic programs to deal with it. The same might also apply to the evaluation of a real candidate.

Unlike the majority of political candidate image studies, this research did not utilize, in any way, the issues of a campaign. Some of the items on the credibility instrument would seem to be dependent almost entirely upon issues. An example would be the item "adventurous-cautious." In addition, while the evaluation of the ideal political candidate may have been free of any reference to specific issues, the respondent may not have been able to evaluate Gerald Ford as a candidate apart from the issues of the campaign.

Finally, all respondents first completed items in reference to the ideal political candidate and then Gerald Ford. In order to avoid any order bias, it would, perhaps, have been more appropriate to switch the sequence of item completion for one-half of the subjects.

Implications for Future Research

The implications of this research lie principally in the prescriptive information provided to real sources within the political campaign context. This study clearly demonstrated that the voting public does not seek out candidates who possess all attributes in extreme quantity. It appears, rather, that from the perspective of both Democrats and Republicans there are some attributes for which moderation is preferred. Additionally, it was shown that members of both parties essentially agree on the conceptualization of the ideal political candidate.

From an historical perspective, this study provided evidence as to the way in which Gerald Ford was perceived by Democrats and

Republicans as a candidate for the Presidency at the time of the 1976 General Election. It is clear from the results of this study that while Ford was perceived by Republicans as being very close to an ideal criterion, he was seen significantly different by Democrats.

From a theoretical perspective, the results of this study suggest several avenues for future research: (1) the determination of specific verbal and nonverbal communicative behaviors which may be utilized by real political candidates to convey the impression of fitting the idealized criterion; (2) the determination of whether or not a real political candidate ever completely matches the ideal conceptualization used by an individual as a referent in making voting decisions; (3) the determination of factors which contribute to the formation of an idealized criterion (for example, the influence of past experience with actual individuals within that target source category); (4) the degree to which an ideal conceptualization is employed by different types of people (for example, authoritarians versus nonauthoritarians) in gauging the acceptability of various political candidates; and (5) the determination of other factors besides political party affiliation which influence the perceptual differentiations between ideal and real political candidates. From a methodological standpoint, it would also be interesting to employ Kaiser rotation procedures to compare factor analytic solutions for ideal and real political candidates.

FOOTNOTES

1. Source valence may be defined as the perceived characteristics of a communication source which lead to the affective bonds or attitudes toward that individual.

2. Source credibility may be defined as the degree of confidence in or favorable disposition toward a communicator.

3. Homophily may be defined as the degree of perceived similarity between source and receiver in reference to a single attribute or a group of attributes.

4. While members of other political parties (69) were present in the original subject population (390), only the data derived from Democrats and Republicans were utilized in the statistical analyses performed in this study.

5. In this research, McCroskey, Jensen, and Todd isolated five dimensions of public figure credibility: (1) competence; (2) character; (3) composure; (4) extroversion; and (5) sociability.

6. For the purposes of this research, these scales were modified to semantic differential form from their original Likert scale form in order to provide consistency among instruments for comparative analysis.

7. In this research, Andersen and Todd isolated three dimensions of public figure homophily: (1) attitude-belief homophily; (2) background homophily; and (3) personality homophily.

8. A male target source was selected so as to establish some perceptual uniformity among the respondents (for example, in conceptualizing the attractiveness of the source), as well as to provide a comparative analysis with the real candidate employed in this study.

9. For the purposes of this research, it was decided that only one real candidate would be employed in the analysis. For purposes of familiarity, a presidential candidate was selected, Gerald Ford being chosen over Jimmy Carter by the flip of a coin.

10. For all analyses employed in this research, the number "one" represented the extreme positive end of the semantic differential scale, while the number "seven" represented the extreme negative end.

11. This criterion was utilized in research of a very similar nature by Hellweg (1976) and Hellweg (1977).

12. It may, in fact, have been the case that the respondents did not want to admit that attractiveness plays a part in their evaluation of the acceptability of political candidates.

REFERENCES

Anatol, Karl W.E. "Communication Perspectives in Political Campaigns," in *Speech Communication: A Basic Anthology,* Edited by Ronald L. Applbaum, Owen O. Jenson, and Richard Carroll, New York: Macmillian Publishing Company, 1975, 312-325.

Andersen, Peter and Todd, William R. "Scales for the Measurement of Homophily with Public Figures," Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, Chicago, Illinois, April 1975.

Hays, William L. *Statistics*, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963.

Hellweg, Susan A. "Perception of a Communication Source: An Examination of the Ideal Political Candidate as a Function of Selected Voter Characteristics," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1977.

Hellweg, Susan A. "Perception of a Communication Source: An Examination of the Ideal Supervisor and Subordinate within a Military Organization," Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, Portland, Oregon, April 1976.

McCroskey, James C., Jensen, Thomas, and Todd, Cynthia, "The Generalizability of Source Credibility Scales for Public Figures," Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Chicago, Illinois, December 1972.

Nimmo, Dan and Savage, Robert L. *Candidates and Their Images: Concepts, Methods, and Findings,* Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing Company, 1976.

Nimmo, Dan and Savage, Robert L. "Political Images and Political Perceptions," *Experimental Study of Politics,* 1971, 1, 1-36.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Target Sources
By Respondent Political Party Affiliation -- Credibility*

Scale Item	Democrats Mean	Democrats Standard Deviation	Republicans Mean	Republicans Standard Deviation
experienced-inexperienced				
ideal candidate	2.036	1.005	1.961	0.930
Gerald Ford	3.042	1.528	2.295	1.234
believable-unbelievable				
ideal candidate	1.766	1.014	1.680	0.803
Gerald Ford	3.693	1.600	2.597	1.176
bold-timid				
ideal candidate	2.531	1.092	2.388	0.946
Gerald Ford	3.938	1.390	3.563	1.290
poised-nervous				
ideal candidate	1.974	1.036	1.946	0.979
Gerald Ford	3.922	1.524	3.271	1.413
attractive-unattractive				
ideal candidate	3.401	1.098	3.349	1.036
Gerald Ford	4.245	1.360	3.729	1.144
sociable-unsociable				
ideal candidate	2.078	0.976	2.240	1.037
Gerald Ford	3.130	1.290	2.884	1.143
admirable-contemptible				
ideal candidate	2.036	1.010	2.023	0.960
Gerald Ford	3.526	1.326	2.837	1.151
adventurous-cautious				
ideal candidate	3.466	1.450	3.648	1.395
Gerald Ford	4.889	1.354	4.124	1.452
nice-awful				
ideal candidate	2.458	1.048	2.310	0.942
Gerald Ford	3.141	1.344	2.543	1.046

---continued---

Scale Item	Democrats Mean	Democrats Standard Deviation	Republicans Mean	Republicans Standard Deviation
reliable-unreliable				
ideal candidate	1.429	0.908	1.203	0.566
Gerald Ford	3.708	1.489	2.659	1.234
relaxed-tense				
ideal candidate	2.286	1.026	2.333	1.113
Gerald Ford	4.283	1.495	3.527	1.329
good-bad				
ideal candidate	1.781	0.906	1.589	0.844
Gerald Ford	3.443	1.375	2.434	1.158
verbal-quiet				
ideal candidate	2.526	1.125	2.690	1.198
Gerald Ford	3.901	1.390	3.492	1.136
energetic-tired				
ideal candidate	1.686	0.812	1.783	0.984
Gerald Ford	3.630	1.382	2.783	1.192
just-unjust				
ideal candidate	1.437	0.810	1.341	0.643
Gerald Ford	3.484	1.436	2.457	1.090
cheerful-gloomy				
ideal candidate	2.182	0.988	2.008	0.874
Gerald Ford	3.552	1.360	2.814	1.178
honest-dishonest				
ideal candidate	1.366	0.748	1.310	0.864
Gerald Ford	3.443	1.428	2.442	1.268
calm-anxious				
ideal candidate	2.995	1.557	2.828	1.293
Gerald Ford	3.849	1.366	3.612	1.233
intellectual-narrow				
ideal candidate	1.921	0.827	1.929	0.896
Gerald Ford	3.563	1.329	2.884	1.216

---continued---

Scale Item	Democrats Mean	Democrats Standard Deviation	Republicans Mean	Republicans Standard Deviation
talkative-silent				
ideal candidate	2.801	1.067	3.172	1.204
Gerald Ford	3.853	1.293	3.465	1.061
kind-cruel				
ideal candidate	2.161	1.088	2.023	0.923
Gerald Ford	3.031	1.116	2.388	0.979
extroverted-introverted				
ideal candidate	2.719	1.146	2.736	1.072
Gerald Ford	4.031	1.282	3.504	1.187
good-natured-irritable				
ideal candidate	1.906	0.820	1.853	0.811
Gerald Ford	3.016	1.268	2.395	1.026
responsible-undependable				
ideal candidate	1.380	0.763	1.287	0.709
Gerald Ford	3.251	1.399	2.352	1.105
aggressive-meek				
ideal candidate	2.578	1.046	2.643	0.942
Gerald Ford	3.942	1.331	3.378	1.195
trained-untrained				
ideal candidate	2.021	1.008	1.930	1.017
Gerald Ford	3.211	1.518	2.362	1.096
competent-incompetent				
ideal candidate	1.568	0.952	1.442	0.749
Gerald Ford	3.393	1.410	2.457	1.118
expert-inexpert				
ideal candidate	2.068	0.992	2.155	1.004
Gerald Ford	3.859	1.449	2.953	1.241
intelligent-unintelligent				
ideal candidate	1.495	0.724	1.442	0.611
Gerald Ford	3.058	1.377	2.328	1.073

*This data was computed using the first interval of the semantic differential as the positive end of the scale and the seventh interval as the negative end.

TABLE 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Target Sources
By Respondent Political Party Affiliation -- Homophily*

Scale Item	Democrats		Republicans	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
background similar to mine-background dissimilar to mine				
ideal candidate	3.555	1.103	3.727	1.127
Gerald Ford	5.111	1.608	4.183	1.455
goals for the country same as mine-goals for the country different than mine				
ideal candidate	2.723	1.143	2.380	0.986
Gerald Ford	4.405	1.668	3.024	1.210
political party same as mine-political party different than mine				
ideal candidate	3.309	1.386	3.380	1.200
Gerald Ford	5.842	1.926	1.825	1.635
personality similar to mine-personality dissimilar to mine				
ideal candidate	3.670	1.166	3.705	1.121
Gerald Ford	4.995	1.630	4.008	1.366
from same social class as mine-from different social class than mine				
ideal candidate	3.759	1.237	3.617	1.293
Gerald Ford	4.984	1.915	3.913	1.762
shares my beliefs-doesn't share my beliefs				
ideal candidate	2.505	1.087	2.310	1.052
Gerald Ford	4.621	1.631	3.205	1.433
like me-unlike me				
ideal candidate	3.463	1.052	3.566	1.045
Gerald Ford	5.195	1.550	3.835	1.385

---continued---

Scale Item	Democrats Mean	Democrats Standard Deviation	Republicans Mean	Republicans Standard Deviation
political attitudes about the same as mine-political attitudes not about the same as mine				
ideal candidate	2.767	1.193	2.605	1.195
Gerald Ford	4.905	1.558	3.152	1.320
cultural background similar to mine-cultural background dissimilar to mine				
ideal candidate	3.521	1.092	3.388	1.010
Gerald Ford	4.863	1.906	3.825	1.683
likes same politicians that I like-doesn't like same politicians that I like				
ideal candidate	3.309	0.981	3.202	1.026
Gerald Ford	5.111	1.513	3.548	1.288
educational background similar to mine-educational background dissimilar to mine				
ideal candidate	3.775	1.398	3.620	1.485
Gerald Ford	4.749	1.798	4.000	1.436
political beliefs same as mine-political beliefs different than mine				
ideal candidate	2.859	1.242	2.496	1.112
Gerald Ford	4.821	1.636	3.173	1.352
goals in life about same as mine-goals in life not about same as mine				
ideal candidate	3.644	1.297	3.395	1.349
Gerald Ford	4.832	1.644	4.024	1.655

*This data was computed using the first interval of the semantic differential as the positive end of the scale and the seventh interval as the negative end.

TABLE 3

Analysis of Variance
Credibility -- Target Sources By Respondent Political Party Affiliation+

Scale Item	Republicans Mean	Democrats Mean	F-Ratio
experienced-inexperienced			
ideal candidate	1.961	2.036	0.459
Gerald Ford	2.295	3.042	21.450*
believable-unbelievable			
ideal candidate	1.680	1.766	0.648
Gerald Ford	2.597	3.693	45.963*
bold-timid			
ideal candidate	2.388	2.531	1.411
Gerald Ford	3.563	3.938	5.914*
poised-nervous			
ideal candidate	1.946	1.974	0.060
Gerald Ford	3.271	3.922	14.896*
attractive-unattractive			
ideal candidate	3.349	3.401	0.183
Gerald Ford	3.729	4.245	12.584*
sociable-unsociable			
ideal candidate	2.240	2.078	2.027
Gerald Ford	2.884	3.130	3.083
admirable-contemptible			
ideal candidate	2.023	2.036	0.013
Gerald Ford	2.837	3.526	24.292*
adventurous-cautious			
ideal candidate	3.648	3.466	1.321
Gerald Ford	4.124	4.889	22.747*
nice-awful			
ideal candidate	2.310	2.458	1.603
Gerald Ford	2.543	3.141	18.165*

---continued---

Scale Item	Republicans Mean	Democrats Mean	F-Ratio
reliable-unreliable			
ideal candidate	1.203	1.429	6.293*
Gerald Ford	2.659	3.708	43.355*
relaxed-tense			
ideal candidate	2.333	2.286	0.214
Gerald Ford	3.527	4.283	21.477*
good-bad			
ideal candidate	1.589	1.781	3.662
Gerald Ford	2.434	3.443	46.972*
verbal-quiet			
ideal candidate	2.690	2.526	1.812
Gerald Ford	3.492	3.901	7.658*
energetic-tired			
ideal candidate	1.783	1.686	0.927
Gerald Ford	2.783	3.630	33.634*
just-unjust			
ideal candidate	1.341	1.437	1.284
Gerald Ford	2.457	3.484	47.551*
cheerful-gloomy			
ideal candidate	2.008	2.182	2.622
Gerald Ford	2.814	3.552	24.257*
honest-dishonest			
ideal candidate	1.310	1.366	0.386
Gerald Ford	2.442	3.443	40.706*
calm-anxious			
ideal candidate	2.828	2.995	1.005
Gerald Ford	3.612	3.849	2.544

---continued---

Scale Item	Republicans Mean	Democrats Mean	F-Ratio
intellectual-narrow			
ideal candidate	1.929	1.921	0.005
Gerald Ford	2.884	3.563	23.538*
talkative-silent			
ideal candidate	3.172	2.801	8.342*
Gerald Ford	3.465	3.853	10.171*
kind-cruel			
ideal candidate	2.023	2.161	1.404
Gerald Ford	2.388	3.031	28.292*
extroverted-introverted			
ideal candidate	2.736	2.719	0.019
Gerald Ford	3.504	4.031	13.856*
good-natured-irritable			
ideal candidate	1.853	1.906	0.332
Gerald Ford	2.395	3.016	21.435*
responsible-undependable			
ideal candidate	1.287	1.380	1.201
Gerald Ford	2.352	3.251	37.312*
aggressive-meek			
ideal candidate	2.643	2.578	0.339
Gerald Ford	3.378	3.942	14.877*
trained-untrained			
ideal candidate	1.930	2.021	0.466
Gerald Ford	2.362	3.211	29.400*
competent-incompetent			
ideal candidate	1.442	1.568	2.804
Gerald Ford	2.457	3.393	39.466*

---continued---

Scale Item	Republicans Mean	Democrats Mean	F-Ratio
expert-inexpert			
ideal candidate	2.155	2.068	0.709
Gerald Ford	2.953	3.859	33.485*
intelligent-unintelligent			
ideal candidate	1.442	1.495	0.401
Gerald Ford	2.328	3.058	25.507*

*Significant at the .05 level

+This data was computed using the first interval of the semantic differential as the positive end of the scale and the seventh interval as the negative end.

TABLE 4

Analysis of Variance
Homophily -- Target Sources By Respondent Political Party Affiliation+

Scale Item	Republicans Mean	Democrats Mean	F-Ratio
background similar to mine-background dissimilar to mine			
ideal candidate	3.727	3.555	1.783
Gerald Ford	4.183	5.111	27.552*
goals for the country same as mine-goals for the country different than mine			
ideal candidate	2.380	2.723	8.424*
Gerald Ford	3.024	4.405	63.460*
political party same as mine-political party different than mine			
ideal candidate	3.380	3.309	0.240
Gerald Ford	1.825	5.842	368.069*
personality similar to mine-personality dissimilar to mine			
ideal candidate	3.705	3.670	0.069
Gerald Ford	4.008	4.995	31.221*
from same social class as mine-from different social class as mine			
ideal candidate	3.617	3.759	1.042
Gerald Ford	3.913	4.984	25.637*
shares my beliefs-doesn't share my beliefs			
ideal candidate	2.310	2.505	3.171
Gerald Ford	3.205	4.621	63.321*
like me-unlike me			
ideal candidate	3.566	3.463	0.450
Gerald Ford	3.835	5.195	63.242*

---continued---

Scale Item	Republicans Mean	Democrats Mean	F-Ratio
political attitudes about the same as mine-political attitudes not about the same as mine			
ideal candidate	2.605	2.767	1.689
Gerald Ford	3.152	4.905	106.172*
cultural background similar to mine-cultural background dissimilar to mine			
ideal candidate	3.388	3.521	1.210
Gerald Ford	3.825	4.863	25.021*
likes same politicians that I like-deosn't like same politicians that I like			
ideal candidate	3.202	3.309	1.161
Gerald Ford	3.548	5.111	89.897*
educational background similar to mine-educational background dissimilar to mine			
ideal candidate	3.620	3.775	0.934
Gerald Ford	4.000	4.749	14.984*
political beliefs same as mine-political beliefs different than mine			
ideal candidate	2.496	2.859	7.237*
Gerald Ford	3.173	4.821	87.482*
goals in life about same as mine-goals in life not about same as mine			
ideal candidate	3.395	3.644	2.742
Gerald Ford	4.024	4.832	18.159*

*Significant at the .05 level
+This data was computed using the first interval of the semantic differential as the positive end of the scale and the seventh interval as the negative end.

TABLE 5

Paired t Values/Strength of Association Values (W^2) -- Ideal Candidate Versus Gerald Ford -- Democrats -- Credibility

Scale Item	Paired t Value	Strength of Association Value
experienced-inexperienced	-8.03	24.85%
believable-inbelievable	-14.91	51.31%
bold-timid	-10.76	37.41%
poised-nervous	-14.92	53.58%
attractive-unattractive	-7.41	21.92%
sociable-unsociable	-9.59	32.13%
admirable-contemptible	-13.79	49.63%
adventurous-cautious	-9.89	33.87%
nice-awful	-5.84	14.77%
reliable-unreliable	-17.92	62.63%
relaxed-tense	-15.23	54.73%
good-bad	-14.66	52.70%
verbal-quiet	-10.38	35.73%
energetic-tired	-16.65	59.12%
just-unjust	-18.59	64.22%
cheerful-gloomy	-11.43	40.31%

---continued---

Scale Item	Paired *t* Value	Strength of Association Value
honest-dishonest	-18.21	63.38%
calm-anxious	-6.12	15.96%
intellectual-narrow	-14.52	52.35%
talkative-silent	-9.00	29.63%
kind-cruel	-7.92	24.33%
extroverted-introverted	-11.05	38.68%
good-natured-irritable	-10.46	36.09%
responsible-undependable	-16.57	58.89%
aggressive-meek	-11.45	40.52%
trained-untrained	-9.35	31.27%
competent-incompetent	-14.54	52.42%
expert-inexpert	-14.14	51.02%
intelligent-unintelligent	-14.48	52.34%

TABLE 6

Paired t Values/Strength of Association Values (W^2) -- Ideal Candidate Versus Gerald Ford -- Democrats -- Homophily

Scale Item	Paired t Value	Strength of Association Value
background similar to mine-background dissimilar to mine	-12.23	44.01%
goals for the country same as mine-goals for the country different than mine	-12.24	44.05%
political party same as mine-political party different than mine	-13.89	50.39%
personality similar to mine-personality dissimilar to mine	-9.32	31.13%
from same social class as mine-from different social class than mine	-7.67	23.33%
shares my beliefs-doesn't share my beliefs	-15.15	54.86%
like me-unlike me	-13.71	49.86%
political attitudes about the same as mine-political attitudes not about the same as mine	-15.15	55.13%
cultural background similar to mine-cultural background dissimilar to mine	-8.83	29.05%
likes same politicians that I like-doesn't like same politicians that I like	-13.79	50.02%
educational background similar to mine-educational background dissimilar to mine	-7.08	20.54%

Scale Item	Paired *t* Value	Strength of Association Value
political beliefs same as mine-political beliefs different than mine	-13.27	48.09%
goals in life about same as mine-goals in life not about same as mine	-8.84	28.99%

TABLE 7

Paired t Values/Strength of Association Values (W^2) -- Ideal Candidate Versus Gerald Ford -- Republicans -- Credibility

Scale Item	Paired t Value	Strength of Association Value
experienced-inexperienced	-2.59	4.24%
believable-inbelievable	-7.76	31.63%
bold-timid	-9.23	39.68%
poised-nervous	-9.83	42.57%
attractive-unattractive	-2.85	5.23%
sociable-unsociable	-5.04	15.91%
admirable-contemptible	-6.84	26.35%
adventurous-cautious	-3.25	6.95%
nice-awful	-2.34	3.35%
reliable-unreliable	-12.50	54.81%
relaxed-tense	-8.77	37.05%
good-bad	-7.44	29.64%
verbal-quiet	-6.67	25.36%
energetic-tired	-8.09	33.32%
just-unjust	-10.71	46.85%
cheerful-gloomy	-7.91	32.48%

---continued---

Scale Item	Paired t Value	Strength of Association Value
honest-dishonest	-8.41	35.09%
calm-anxious	-6.30	23.21%
intellectual-narrow	-7.90	32.77%
talkative-silent	-2.58	4.23%
kind-cruel	-3.82	9.53%
extroverted-introverted	-6.96	26.89%
good-natured-irritable	-5.55	18.77%
responsible-undependable	-9.95	43.36%
aggressive-meek	-6.52	24.63%
trained-untrained	-3.87	9.91%
competent-incompetent	-10.17	44.65%
expert-inexpert	-6.27	23.04%
intelligent-unintelligent	-9.28	39.94%

TABLE 8

Paired t Values/Strength of Association Values (W^2) -- Ideal Candidate Versus Gerald Ford -- Republicans -- Homophily

Scale Item	Paired t Value	Strength of Association Value
background similar to mine-background dissimilar to mine	-3.14	6.62%
goals for the country same as mine-goals for the country different than mine	-5.38	18.15%
political party same as mine-political party different than mine	8.72	37.33%
personality similar to mine-personality dissimilar to mine	-2.13	2.69%
from same social class as mine-from different social class than mine	-1.55	1.11%
shares my beliefs-doesn't share my beliefs	-6.00	21.61%
like me-unlike me	-2.25	3.10%
political attitudes about the same as mine-political attitudes not about the same as mine	-4.13	11.38%
cultural background similar to mine-cultural background dissimilar to mine	-2.79	5.11%
likes same politicians that I like-doesn't like same politicians that I like	-2.94	5.72%
educational background similar to mine-educational background dissimilar to mine	-2.40	3.61%

Scale Item	Paired *t* Value	Strength of Association Value
political beliefs same as mine-political beliefs different than mine	-4.89	15.28%
goals in life about same as mine-goals in life not about same as mine	-4.16	11.38%

TABLE 9

Data Analysis for Single Likert Scale Item --
Idealness of Gerald Ford as a Candidate

Frequency Distribution for Democrats

Code	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (Percent)	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)	Cumulative Frequency (Percent)
1.	4	2.1	2.2	2.2
2.	24	12.5	13.1	15.3
3.	31	16.1	16.9	32.2
4.	19	9.9	10.4	42.6
5.	23	12.0	12.6	55.2
6.	42	21.9	23.0	78.1
7.	40	20.8	21.9	100.0
9.	9	4.7	MISSING	100.0
TOTAL	192	100.0	100.0	

Mean = 4.743 Mode = 6.000 Standard Deviation = 1.835 Median = 5.087

Frequency Distributions for Republicans

Code	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (Percent)	Adjusted Frequency (Percent)	Cumulative Frequency (Percent)
1.	10	7.8	8.1	8.1
2.	42	32.6	34.1	42.3
3.	33	25.6	26.8	69.1
4.	15	11.6	12.2	81.3
5.	10	7.8	8.1	89.4
6.	11	8.5	8.9	98.4
7.	2	1.6	1.6	100.0
9.	6	4.7	MISSING	100.0
TOTAL	129	100.0	100.0	

Mean = 3.114 Mode = 2.000 Standard Deviation = 1.478 Median = 2.788